

Attorneys for Plaintiffs

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**  
**NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA, SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION**

SOFIE KARASEK, individually;  
NICOLETTA COMMINS, individually;  
ARYLE BUTLER, individually;

Plaintiffs,

VS.

THE REGENTS OF THE UNIVERSITY  
OF CALIFORNIA, a public entity, and  
DOES 1 through 100, inclusive,

Defendants.

Case No: 3:15-cv-03717-WHO

**STIPULATION TO EXTEND TIME TO  
RESPOND TO DEFENDANT’S RULE  
12(B)(6) MOTION TO DISMISS;  
AMENDED ORDER**

Place: Courtroom 2, 17th Floor  
Judge: Hon. William H. Orrick

**STIPULATION TO EXTEND TIME TO RESPOND TO DEFENDANT'S RULE 12(B)(6)**

**MOTION TO DISMISS**

Pursuant to Local Rule 6-1, the parties to the above entitled action, by and through their respective counsel of record, hereby stipulate as follows:

WHEREAS, Plaintiffs filed their Third Amended Complaint ("TAC") in this Court on April 11, 2016;

WHEREAS, Defendant filed a Rule 12(b)(6) Motion to Dismiss Plaintiffs' Third Amended Complaint ("Motion to Dismiss") on May 9, 2016;

WHEREAS, Plaintiffs' response to Defendant's Motion to Dismiss is due on May 23, 2016;

WHEREAS, the Parties have agreed that Plaintiffs may have an extension of 7 days to respond to Defendant's Motion to Dismiss, which would make Plaintiffs' response due on Tuesday, May 31, 2016;

WHEREAS, currently, Defendant's reply to Plaintiffs' response is due on May 31, 2016;

WHEREAS, the Parties have agreed that Defendant's new deadline to reply to Plaintiffs' response to Defendant's Motion to Dismiss would be June 10, 2016;

WHEREAS, currently, the hearing date on Defendant's Motion to Dismiss is scheduled for June 15, 2016;

WHEREAS, if, given the new briefing schedule, the original hearing date is not convenient for the Court, the Court will move the hearing date to June 22, 2016; and

WHEREAS, this stipulation will not alter any other date of any event or any deadline already fixed by Court order.

IT IS HEREBY STIPULATED between Plaintiffs and Defendant, by and through their undersigned attorneys, that Plaintiff shall have a 7-day extension to respond to Defendant's Rule 12(b)(6) Motion to Dismiss Plaintiff's Third Amended Complaint, making Plaintiffs' response due on or before May 31, 2016.

1 DATED: May 20, 2016

MUNGER, TOLLES & OLSON LLP  
BRADLEY S. PHILLIPS  
HAILYN J. CHEN

2  
3 By: /s/ Jeslyn A. Everitt  
Jeslyn A. Everitt  
Attorneys for Defendant

4  
5 DATED: May 20, 2016

THE ZALKIN LAW FIRM, P.C.  
IRWIN M. ZALKIN  
DEVIN M. STOREY  
ALEXANDER S. ZALKIN  
RYAN M. COHEN

6  
7  
8 By: /s/ Alexander S. Zalkin  
Alexander S. Zalkin  
Attorneys for Plaintiffs


9  
10  
11 **AMENDED ORDER**

12 Plaintiffs' new response to Defendant's Motion to Dismiss is due on Tuesday, May 31,  
13 2016;

14 Defendant's new deadline to reply to Plaintiffs' response to Defendant's Motion to Dismiss  
15 is due on June 10, 2016;

16 The hearing date on Defendant's Motion to Dismiss is scheduled for June 15, 2016; given  
17 the new briefing schedule, the original hearing date is not convenient for the Court, the Court moves  
18 the hearing date to June 22, 2016.

19  
20 Dated: May 25, 2016

  
Hon. William H. Orrick  
Judge of the United States District Court